



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

PM

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/735,718

12/12/2000

Stephen Ma

2705-93

5593

20575

7590

11/03/2005

MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW MORRISON STREET, SUITE 400
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

HO, DUC CHI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2665

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/735,718

Applicant(s)

MA ET AL

Examiner

Duc C. Ho

Art Unit

2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,9,14 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8, 10-13, and 16-22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,954,463. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

Regarding claim 1, lines 1-12 (see 6,954,463 at col. 14-line 25 to col. 15-line 2).

For claim 1, Applicant merely broaden the scope of patent number 6,954,463 by eliminating the terms " maintaining a forwarding routing table ----assigned to that processor" in claim 5 of the patent.

It has been held that the omission of an element and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before. In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA). Also note Ex Parte Raine, 168 USPQ 375 (bd. App. 1969); therefore omission of a reference element whose function is not needed would be obvious to one skilled in the art.

3. Claim 14 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,954,463. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

Regarding claim 14, lines 1-14 (see 6,954,463 at col. 16, lines 31-48).

For claim 14, Applicant merely broaden the scope of patent number 6,954,463 by eliminating the terms “ the distributing means ----headers of that data packet”, lines 48-52, in claim 18 of the patent.

It has been held that the omission of an element and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before. In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA). Also note Ex Parte Raine, 168 USPQ 375 (bd. App. 1969); therefore omission of a reference element whose function is not needed would be obvious to one skilled in the art.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,954,463. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

Regarding claim 9, lines 1-13 (see 6,954,463 at col. 15, lines 29-45).

For claim 9, Applicant merely changes the scope of patent number 6,954,463 by replacing the limitation “to perform a routing table lookup for a received packet”, lines 5-6 with “to examine one or more header fields from one or more headers of the egress packet”, col. 16, lines 63-64, in claim 9 of the patent.

Since the remaining elements perform the same function as before, the omission of a reference is obvious to one skilled in the art.

5. Claim 15 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,954,463. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

Regarding claim 15, lines 1-14 (see 6,954,463 at col. 16-line 58 to col. 17-line 10).

For claim 15, Applicant merely changes one word in the preamble of patent number 6,954,463. The word “concentrator”, line 1 has been changed from the word “server”, line 1, in claim 20 of the patent.

Since the remaining elements perform the same function as before, the omission of a reference is obvious to one skilled in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 2-8, 10-13, and 16-22 are objected to as being independent upon rejected base claims, but would be allowable if the rejected base claims have overcome the rejection set forth as above.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-3147. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu, can be reached on (571) 272-3155.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent Examiner

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Duc Ho", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Duc Ho

10-31-05